

# **SCAAC Meeting Minutes**

***(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)***

September 18, 1998  
State Board Room

## **SCAAC Agenda**

<b>#</b>	<b>Agenda Items</b>	<b>Presenters</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting Business</b>	<b>Anne Keene</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Phone Conference Call</b>	<b>Sue Rigney</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Scholastic Audit Issues</b>	<b>Bob Lumsden</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Commonwealth School Improvement Funds</b>	<b>Bob Lumsden</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Highly Skilled Educators</b>	<b>Bob Lumsden</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessment Blueprint/Core Content Match</b>	<b>Rhonda Sims</b>
<b>Adjournment</b>		

## **SCAAC Meeting Minutes September 18, 1998**

### **1. Meeting Business**

**Anne Keene**

Copies of audiotapes of the meeting are available upon request.  
Chairperson Anne Keene called the meeting to order. Jon Frederick called the roll.

#### Members Present:

Kay Freeland	Anne Keene	Roger Pankratz
Suzanne Guyer	Benny Lile	Linda Sheffield
Maxie Johnson	Gary Mielcarek	Bob Young

The Council looked at the schedule of dates for future meetings. Dates for future meetings were announced:

October 14 & 26-27 (report card, accountability model);  
March 9-10; and  
November 9-10 (student accountability);  
May 17-18.  
January 6-7 (special needs, district accountability);

Total Meeting Time: 3 hours

### **2. Phone Conference Call**

**Anne Keene**

Anne Keene recognized Sue Rigney to discuss some of the questions the Council might consider in preparation for the phone conference with Dr. James Catterall. The questions included:

1. Will the NTAPAA paper be revised? When?
2. Is the target of 100 reasonable?
3. Can NTAPAA meet with the Council to discuss accountability model. If so, what preparations need to be made?
4. When will standard setting be done?
5. What is the justification for 5% NRT security?
6. What some ways to get more equitable standards?

The Council discussed some of the questions surrounding the NTAPAA paper. The discussion focused inclusion of the NRT (norm reference test) in an accountability model. NTAPAA suggested that an NRT which would be "sufficiently aligned" to Kentucky's Core Content might be included in the accountability index. The Council previously had recommended excluding the NRT from an accountability index based on the belief that there would be a low degree of match to Core Content.

Gary Mielcarek asked whether or not the inclusion of multiple choice items on the old

KIRIS tests had not addressed some of the needs that an NRT would supposedly address. It was noted that those multiple choice items were developed specifically with Kentucky's Core Content.

The Council generally sought clarification on exactly what NTAPAA's rationale was in recommending the inclusion of NRT at this juncture. Benny Lile noted that he had based his previous vote on what Dr. Catterall had advised in past conversations with the Council. The question is has he changed his mind and if so, why? What factors have come into play?

Gary Mielcarek referenced a phrase in the NTAPAA document which stated " . . . validity is an overall evaluative judgment of the adequacy and appropriateness of a particular use or interpretation of assessment results." He asked, "whose judgment." The answer to that question was discussed and it was decided to put the question to Dr. Catterall.

At this point, Dr. James Catterall began his conference call with Council. The following represents the discussion in part:

SCAAC Question:

Will the NTAPAA revise the paper presented to the Council?

Answer:

This is an on-going process but the Panel is working on the document.

SCAAC Question:

When will standard setting be done?

Answer:

Standards do need be revisited and as soon as a plan to do that is in place the better.

SCAAC Question:

If you have different groups ( science, math), is there some way to assure that the work is normative?

Answer:

The key is to involve practitioners as much as possible in the standard setting; draw upon the expertise in the field.

SCAAC Question:

Is the target of 100 reasonable?

Answer:

Dr. Catterall noted that the model NTAPAA presented does not set a target of that kind. He said the panel "bridled" at the notion that all schools could reach that target. He noted that no schools in the past had come very close to that mark and it might be a

good symbol but that it may not be realistic. He also noted that NTAPAA was considering its model and given the time frame all parties progress was about as far along as it could be.

SCAAC Question:

Are you suggesting that resetting the standard would make the arrival at the 100 target more feasible.

Answer:

Yes, it could be that your 100 definition was the problem. Lowering standards is not desirable.

SCAAC Question:

Did NTAPAA discuss problems with fluctuation?

Answer:

Yes, that was discussed and the need to be consistent and avoid wide swings is desirable.

SCAAC Question:

If schools are declining in two biennia, are you saying that triggers the scholastic audit?

Answer:

Yes.

SCAAC Question:

How would you define the four categories—declining, maintaining, progressing, and strong?

Answer:

Dr. Catterall discussed the Biennial Standing chart.

SCAAC Question:

In regard to the NRT, what was the justification for the 5% suggestion?

Answer:

That the NRT should count some but not heavily; does not have to count at all but that raises the question of why do it all. Also, NRT could be used in some longitudinal way. It adds another piece to the base—broadens. This providing the NRT has suitable Core Content match. Having more information is better.

SCAAC Question:

What is the security issue?

Answer:

There is a security issue; it becomes less of an issue when NRT is just a piece of larger

components used in the assessment. Dr. Catterall was asked to address the problems with mobility rates. Should some adjustment be made to account for mobility rates? Dr. Catterall noted that this is a very difficult issue and could become a complicated formula to work with in the accountability model. He also noted that the Panel did not walk through all the issues of this problem. He did suggest if you test in the spring, then you might want to say that all those tested must have been in that school since September of that school year. Anne Keene emphasized that in Kentucky we did want all students tested and we wanted all students it to count.

Gary Mielcarek asked Dr. Catterall about the nature of "evaluative judgment." He noted that in the past experts had played such an important role in Kentucky's considerations of validity.

Dr. Catterall noted that one of the guidelines his Panel is working under is an understanding that they must be watchful of the way judgments will be rendered and what experts over time will have to say about the issues of validity and soundness of the test—a desire to head off someone coming along in the next few years and saying, "well, you got it wrong." His panel wants to be sure that decisions are reasonable and defensible. Gary's basic concern is simply that Kentucky does not want a problem with technical issues down the road.

---

Chairperson Anne Keene called a recess.  
After the recess, Anne Keene reconvened the Council.

---

Roger Pankratz commented that he felt there was a disparity between what the NTAPAA was discussing and recommending and what the Council has been recommending. He expressed an interest in having some time to meet with Dr. Catterall and other NTAPAA members. Roger feels that it would invaluable to meet for whatever time they could be available for as soon as possible and said he would make whatever effort necessary to attend such a meeting. Chair noted Roger's concerns and offered to attempt to arrange a meeting.

### **3. Scholastic Audit Issues**

**Bob Lumsden**

Chairperson Anne Keene focused the Council's attention on the Scholastic Audit issues, picking up on the discussion from yesterday's session. She called attention to the charts generated yesterday, emphasizing the key concerns relative to the Scholastic Audit. Roger Pankratz clarified that his concern still was on the questions of whether the data can be generated and used effectively. The collection and interpretation of the data are the crux of the discussion.

Gary Mielcarek asked if when the new system is configured would the old indices be revised so that low performing schools indices would be raised? Generally, the response was that low performing schools would still be low performing regardless of any changes in the scale relatively speaking.

Anne asked Bob if the Council could get an update as the process moves forward.

Roger Pankratz moved to accept the scholastic audit process and plan in general with the following recommendations:

1. Quick assistance to low-performing schools.
2. Establish priority order for data evaluation.
3. Define/support local data evaluation process.
4. Greater specificity regarding use of Commonwealth School Improvement Funds.
5. Base district accountability on effective support for local capacity building.
6. Local audit must focus on student performance and teaching practices.
7. How to involve universities in local capacity building as partners.
8. How to allocate regional resources:
  - a. by number of schools,
  - b. by number of students (school size), and
  - c. by level of need

#### **4. Commonwealth School Improvement Funds**

**Bob Lumsden**

A second issue from the chart was specificity of use for Commonwealth School Improvement Funds. This is one area that needs further discussion and resolution. Also discussed from the charts was the high priority of building capacity within local schools so that systemic change is effective. The role of universities as partners in the capacity-building function was also discussed and affirmed. Another key issue is prioritizing use of both funds and Highly Skilled Educators' assignments.

#### **5. Highly Skilled Educators**

**Bob Lumsden**

Linda Sheffield noted the difference in the number of schools needing or who might need assistance and the number of Highly Skilled Educators who will be available for assignment. There may be a considerable gap in meeting the needs given the current pool of Highly Skilled Educators. Regarding assignments, Bob Lumsden stated that some paradigm or prioritized system is not only practical but necessary given the current data.

The Council decided to rule out the "fixed threshold" option. The Council seemed to be in agreement that schools may need some recourse to applying for an Highly Skilled Educators even if particular schools do not fall in the lowest percentage range on the index. Maxie Johnson noted that schools in the lowest 5% need priority even if those schools are showing progress over time—the need is still there. Anne Keene asked if

the Council were in agreement that priority should be the percentage of lowest performing schools. Bob Lumsden stated that those schools in the lowest performing schools were automatically in Level III and that calls for a scholastic audit. At the heart of this discussion is the dilemma of fewer resources (Highly Skilled Educators) and what may be a greater need than the availability of resources.

Suzanne Guyer asked who would make the ultimate call on those schools who would receive assistance—funding will be allocated by region; however, is there a process for local schools to follow to apply for the funds? Bob Lumsden said that the Scholastic Audit Review Committee would make that call under the plan outlined.

Kay Freeland noted that for the next two years schools would be encouraged to all within their power to address the needs. After 2000, a mechanism would be established to address the needs, kinds of assistance, and levels of assistance, but during the interim period, immediately some plan is necessary for schools to meet their needs to move forward toward continuous growth. Bob Lumsden noted that in this interim period 1998-2000 Kay's comment was accurate. Kay and Anne both expressed grave concern over letting any students slip through the crack and fail to effectively address critical needs.

Anne Keene asked Bob Lumsden when assignments could be made. Bob answered that January would be feasible.

## **6. Assessment Blueprint/Core Content Match**

**Rhonda Sims**

Rhonda Sims presented a report on the assessment blueprint and core content match activities recently conducted using Kentucky teachers. Rhonda presented using a series of overhead transparencies.

The first segment of the presentation dealt with the test blueprint activity. The presentation explained who was involved, how the day was planned, and the results. Anne Keene asked if the results of the blueprint would be made available. The results will be available as soon as possible.

In the second segment of the presentation, Rhonda presented the Core Content match activities. Involvement of Kentucky teachers was the key to the successful work of the two activities.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Anne Keene thanked Rhonda for the work that has been done.

Benny Lile raised the issues of the various grade configurations and the problems this poses for any discussion on district accountability. Helen Mountjoy spoke to this issue and informed the Council that one option the Kentucky Board of Education is looking at is a P-8 configuration for accountability purposes; this is an effort to create a more seamless progression in the accountability unit.

Anne Keene informed the Council that on Monday the Kentucky Board of Education would be meeting and finalizing selection of test contract. On Tuesday at 9:00 a.m., there will be telecast on the Star Channel featuring Commissioner Cody, Helen Mountjoy, and others who will make the announcement on the selection of a contractor.

### **Adjournment**

#### SCAAC Motion:

Motion to adjourn was made by Suzanne Guyer and seconded by Maxie Johnson. Chairperson Anne Keene adjourned the meeting.